1	CENTER FOR DISABILITY ACCESS Chris Carson, Esq., SBN 280048	
2	Ray Ballister, Jr., Esq., SBN 111282 Phyl Grace, Esq., SBN 171771 Dennis Price, Esq., SBN 279082	
3	Dennis Price, Esq., SBN 279082 Mail: PO Box 262490	
4	San Diego, CA 92196-2490	
5	<u>Delivery</u> : 9845 Erma Road, Suite 300 San Diego, CA 92131	
6	(858) 375-7385; (888) 422-5191 fax phylg@potterhandy.com	
7	Attorneys for Plaintiff	
8	J	
9		
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
11	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
12	Danica Viah	Case No.
13	Denise Kish,	
14	Plaintiff,	Complaint For Damages And Injunctive Relief For Violations Of: American's With Disabilities
15	V.	Act; Unruh Civil Rights Act
16	Skate Ranch , a California Corporation; and Does 1-10,	-
17	Defendants.	
18		
19	Plaintiff Denise Kish complains of Defendants Skate Ranch, a	
20	California Corporation; and Does 1-10 ("Defendants") and alleges as follows:	
21		
22	PARTIES:	
23	1. Plaintiff is a California resident with physical disabilities. She suffers	
24	from multiple sclerosis and uses a wheelchair for mobility.	
25	2. Defendant Skate Ranch owned the real property located at or about	
26	34225 Rancho California Rd., Temecula, California, in October 2017.	
27	3. Defendant Skate Ranch owned the real property located at or about	
28	34225 Rancho California Rd., Temecula, California, in December 2017.	

- 2 3
- 4 5
- 6 7
- 9

- 10 11
- 12 13
- 14
- 15 16
- 17
- 18 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 24

23

- 25 26
- 27 28

- 4. Defendant Skate Ranch owns the real property located at or about 34225 Rancho California Rd., Temecula, California, currently.
- 5. Defendant Skate Ranch owned Maurice Car'rie Winery located at or about 34225 Rancho California Rd., Temecula, California, in October 2017.
- 6. Defendant Skate Ranch owned Maurice Car'rie Winery located at or about 34225 Rancho California Rd., Temecula, California, in December 2017.
- 7. Defendant Skate Ranch owns Maurice Car'rie Winery ("Winery") located at or about 34225 Rancho California Rd., Temecula, California, currently.
- 8. Plaintiff does not know the true names of Defendants, their business capacities, their ownership connection to the property and business, or their relative responsibilities in causing the access violations herein complained of, and alleges a joint venture and common enterprise by all such Defendants. Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the Defendants herein, including Does 1 through 10, inclusive, is responsible in some capacity for the events herein alleged, or is a necessary party for obtaining appropriate relief. Plaintiff will seek leave to amend when the true names, capacities, connections, and responsibilities of the Defendants and Does 1 through 10, inclusive, are ascertained.

JURISDICTION & VENUE:

- 9. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and § 1343(a)(3) & (a)(4) for violations of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. § 12101, et seq.
- 10. Pursuant to supplemental jurisdiction, an attendant and related cause of action, arising from the same nucleus of operative facts and arising out of the same transactions, is also brought under California's Unruh Civil Rights

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS:

12. Plaintiff went to the Winery in October 2017 and December 2017 to buy wine.

Act, which act expressly incorporates the Americans with Disabilities Act.

11. Venue is proper in this court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and is

founded on the fact that the real property which is the subject of this action is

located in this district and that Plaintiff's cause of action arose in this district.

- 13. The Winery is a facility open to the public, a place of public accommodation, and a business establishment.
- 14. Wine tasting counters are one of the facilities, privileges and advantages offered by Defendants to patrons of the Winery.
- 15. Wine is served at a counter or bar for consumption by customers either seated on stools or standing at the counter or bar but there is no portion of the counter that is 34 inches in height or less.
- 16. In fact, the counter or bar used for wine tasting is located some 48.5 inches above the finish floor.
- 17. Currently, there is no counter or bar that has a portion that is 34 inches in height or less.
- 18. Restrooms are one of the facilities, privileges and advantages offered by Defendants to patrons of the Winery.
- 19. Unfortunately, the height of the toilet in the women's restroom, when measured to the top of the toilet seat, is about 15.5 inches.
- 20. Because of the barriers at the Winery, plaintiff purchased wine and left the facility without being able to stay and enjoy the facilities.
 - 21. Plaintiff personally encountered these barriers.
- 22. These inaccessible conditions denied the plaintiff full and equal access and caused her difficulty, discomfort, and embarrassment.

6

7

- 8 9
- 11

12

10

- 13 14 15
- 16 17
- 18 19
- 20 21
- 22
- 24

25

23

- 26
- 27 28

- 23. Plaintiff plans to return and patronize the Winery but will be deterred from visiting until the defendants remove the barriers.
- 24. The Defendants have failed to maintain in working and useable conditions those features required to provide ready access to persons with disabilities.
- 25. The barriers identified above are easily removed without much difficulty or expense. They are the types of barriers identified by the Department of Justice as presumably readily achievable to remove and, in fact, these barriers are readily achievable to remove. Moreover, there are numerous alternative accommodations that could be made to provide a greater level of access if complete removal were not achievable.
- 26. Plaintiff is and has been deterred from returning and patronizing the Winery because of her knowledge of the barriers that exist. Plaintiff will, nonetheless, return to assess ongoing compliance with the ADA and will return to patronize the Winery as a customer once the barriers are removed.
- 27. Given the obvious and blatant nature of the barriers and violations alleged herein, the plaintiff alleges, on information and belief, that there are other violations and barriers on the site that relate to her disability. Plaintiff will amend the complaint, to provide proper notice regarding the scope of this lawsuit, once she conducts a site inspection. However, please be on notice that the plaintiff seeks to have all barriers related to her disability remedied. See Doran v. 7-11, 524 F.3d 1034 (9th Cir. 2008) (holding that once a plaintiff encounters one barrier at a site, she can sue to have all barriers that relate to his disability removed regardless of whether she personally encountered them).
- 28. Additionally, on information and belief, the plaintiff alleges that the failure to remove these barriers was intentional because: (1) these particular barriers are intuitive and obvious; (2) the defendants exercised control and

3

4 5

6 7

9

8

10 11

12

13 14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27 28

dominion over the conditions at this location and, therefore, the lack of accessible facilities was not an "accident" because had the defendants intended any other configuration, they had the means and ability to make the change.

I. FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990 (On behalf of Plaintiff and against all

Defendants.) (42 U.S.C. section 12101, et seq.)

- 29. Plaintiff re-pleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth again herein, the allegations contained in all prior paragraphs of this complaint.
- 30. Under the ADA, it is an act of discrimination to fail to ensure that the privileges, advantages, accommodations, facilities, goods and services of any place of public accommodation is offered on a full and equal basis by anyone who owns, leases, or operates a place of public accommodation. See 42 U.S.C. § 12182(a). Discrimination is defined, inter alia, as follows:
 - a. A failure to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices, or procedures, when such modifications are necessary to afford goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, accommodations to individuals with disabilities, unless the accommodation would work a fundamental alteration of those services and facilities. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(ii).
 - b. A failure to remove architectural barriers where such removal is readily achievable. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv). Barriers are defined by reference to the ADAAG, found at 28 C.F.R., Part 36, Appendix "D."
 - c. A failure to make alterations in such a manner that, to the maximum extent feasible, the altered portions of the facility are

15

17

20

23

25

26

27 28 readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities, including individuals who use wheelchairs or to ensure that, to the maximum extent feasible, the path of travel to the altered area and the bathrooms, telephones, and drinking fountains serving the altered area, are readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities. 42 U.S.C. § 12183(a)(2).

- 31. Where food or drink is served at counters exceeding 34 inches in height for consumption by customers seated on stools or standing at the counter, a portion of the main counter which is 60 inches in length minimum shall be provided that is no higher than 34 inches above the floor or service shall be available at accessible tables within the same area. 1991 Standards § 5.2 and 4.32; 2010 Standards § 226.1. If seating is provided for persons in wheelchairs at the counter or bar, there must be knee clearance for wheelchair users measuring at least 27 inches high, 30 inches wide, and 19 inches deep. 1991 Standards § 4.32.3; 2010 Standards § 306.3 (the 2010 Standards actually require a different depth).
- 32. Here the failure to provide an accessible counter/bar is a violation of the law.
- 33. The height of water closets (toilets) must be from 17 inches to 19 inches, measured to the top of the toilet seat.
 - 34. Here the toilet seat is too low and does not comply with the ADA.
 - 35. The failure to provide an accessible entrance is a violation of the law.
- 36. A public accommodation must maintain in operable working condition those features of its facilities and equipment that are required to be readily accessible to and usable by persons with disabilities. 28 C.F.R. § 36.211(a).
- 37. Here, the failure to ensure that the accessible facilities were available and ready to be used by the plaintiff is a violation of the law.
 - 38. Given its location and options, plaintiff will continue to desire to

1

3

4

5

6

7

8 9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23 24

25

27

26 28

against due to the lack of accessible facilities and, therefore, seeks injunctive relief to remove the barriers.

patronize the Winery but she has been and will continue to be discriminated

II. SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF THE UNRUH CIVIL

RIGHTS ACT (On behalf of Plaintiff and against all Defendants.) (Cal. Civ. Code § 51-53.)

- 39. Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth again herein, the allegations contained in all prior paragraphs of this complaint. The Unruh Civil Rights Act ("Unruh Act") guarantees, inter alia, that persons with disabilities are entitled to full and equal accommodations, advantages, facilities, privileges, or services in all business establishment of every kind whatsoever within the jurisdiction of the State of California. Cal. Civ. Code §51(b).
- 40. The Unruh Act also provides that a violation of the ADA, or of California state accessibility regulations, is a violation of the Unruh Act. Cal. Civ. Code, § 51(f); Arnold v. United Artists Theatre Circuit, Inc., 866 F.Supp. 433, 439 (N.D.Cal.1994).
- 41. Defendants' acts and omissions, as herein alleged, have violated the Unruh Act by, inter alia, denying, or aiding, or inciting the denial of, Plaintiff's rights to full and equal use of the accommodations, advantages, facilities, privileges, or services offered.
- 42. Defendants' acts and omissions, as herein alleged, have also violated the Unruh Act by denying, or aiding or inciting the denial of, Plaintiff's right to equal access arising from the provisions of the ADA (see Plaintiff's First Cause of Action).
- 43. Because the violation of the Unruh Civil Rights Act resulted in difficulty, discomfort or embarrassment for the plaintiff, the defendants are also each

1 responsible for statutory damages, i.e., a civil penalty. (Civ. Code § 55.56(a)-2 (c).) 3 4 **PRAYER:** Wherefore, Plaintiff prays that this Court award damages and provide 5 relief as follows: 6 7 1. For injunctive relief, compelling Defendants to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act and the Unruh Civil Rights Act. Note: the 8 plaintiff is not invoking section 55 of the California Civil Code and is not 9 10 seeking injunctive relief under the Disabled Persons Act at all. 11 2. Damages under the Unruh Civil Rights Act, which provides for actual damages and a statutory minimum of \$4,000. 12 13 3. Reasonable attorney fees, litigation expenses and costs of suit, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12205; and Cal. Civ. Code § § 52. 14 15 16 Dated: April 9, 2018 CENTER FOR DISABILITY ACCESS 17 18 By: 19 20 Chris Carson, Esq. Attorney for plaintiff 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28